

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/700,207   | 11/03/2003  | David B. Skursha     | 3206                    | 4179             |
| 7590 08/23/2005 THE LUBRIZOL CORPORATION Patent Administrator - Mail Drop 022B |             |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
|  |             |                      | NGHIEM, MICHAEL P       |                  |
| 29400 Lakeland Boulevard<br>Wickliffe, OH 44092-2298                           |             |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 2863                    | :                |
|  |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005 |                  |
|  |             |                      |                         | :                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)               |  |  |  |
|---|-------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Notice of About demonstrate   | 10/700,207        | SKURSHA ET AL.             |  |  |  |
| Notice of Abandonment   | Examiner          | Art Unit                   |  |  |  |
|   | Michael P. Nghiem | 2863                       |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap   |                   | correspondence address     |  |  |  |
| This application is abandoned in view of:   |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on 29 November 2004.      (a)    A reply was received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of month(s)) which expired on      (b)    A proposed reply was received on, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection. |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).  |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| (c) A reply was received on 10 June 2005 but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).   |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| (d) No reply has been received.   |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).   |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).   |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| (b) The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance of \$ is due.  |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$   |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| (c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.  |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).   |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.  |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.   |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| 4. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.   |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| 5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.  |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| 6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.  |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| 7.   The reason(s) below:   | MCHAE             | LNGLIEM                    |  |  |  |
| See Continuation Sheet  | PRIMARY           | EXAER                      |  |  |  |
|   | de de             | 105/                       |  |  |  |
| Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.  |                   |                            |  |  |  |
| U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  | of Abandonment    | Part of Paper No. 20050815 |  |  |  |

Item 7 - Other reasons for holding abandonment: The reply filed on June 10, 2005 is not fully responsive because Applicant did not respond to the Office objection (Nov 29, 2004) to the spec which requires that the spec be amended to reflect the canceled Figs. 5-15. For instance, pages 12, 15, 18, 21 still discuss Figs. 5-8. Applicant was given the opportunity to correct the spec on May 23, 2005 but failed to do so. Further, items (A) and (B) indicated in the Declaration Under 37 CFR 1.131 were not received by the Office.